

MENANDER PROTECTOR

BARRY BALDWIN

LITTLE has been written, in English or any other language, on Menander Protector,¹ yet his fragments are among the most considerable of those preserved in the *Excerpta de legationibus* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. He is, of necessity, a major source of information for the diplomatic and military history of the reigns of Justin II and Tiberius. He also merits attention as a relatively neglected member of the sequence of Byzantine *Profanhistoriker* that stretches from Eunapius to Theophylact Simocatta.²

There are very few external *testimonia* to the existence of Menander. Theophylact briefly commends his account of the siege of Sirmium (1.3,5). Along with Procopius, Agathias, and Hesychius, he is adduced (with some chronological inaccuracy, as will be seen) by Constantine Porphyrogenitus on a matter of provincial nomenclature (*De them.* 1.2, Bonn ed. [1840], p. 18). The epigram he dashed off on the martyrdom of Isbozetes, the Persian magus who converted to Christianity (frag. 35), is included in the *Anthology* (*AP* 1.101). His absence from the *Bibliotheca* of Photius is worth remarking.³

What little we know of Menander is owed to the extract from his own Preface preserved in the *Suda* (ed. Adler, M 591). It may be suggestive that the compiler contents himself almost entirely with verbatim quotation, adding only the obvious fact that Menander was a historian.

Menander's father was a certain Euphratas, a native of Constantinople and a man quite devoid of formal education. There was also a brother named (nicely enough) Herodotus, who was a dropout from law school. With such familial examples, it is perhaps not surprising that Menander himself became unruly for a while; not, however, before studying law, which was proper, or so he says. His study of law is a theme which could well have been polished up later in retrospect, intended at least partly as homage to his model Agathias. A striking linguistic debt⁴ may enhance such an interpretation, as might his admitted aversion to the onerous life of a lawyer, a standard complaint indulged in also by Agathias (3.1,4).

It is obvious that Menander is here engaging in studied and favorable comparison between himself and his father and brother. How good a student he actually was is discreetly concealed; we are told that he concluded his studies ὡς μοι ὑπῆρχε δυνάτον.⁵ Even after due allowance for the convention of modesty

¹ The only significant studies are: M. Apostolopoulos, *Μένανδρος Προτέκτωρ μιμητής Ἀγαθίου* (Athens, 1894); V. Valdenberg, "Le idee politiche di Procopio e di Menandro Protettore," *StB*, 4 (1935), 65–85; O. Veh, *Beiträge zu Menander Protektor* (Fürth-Beirut, 1955).

² Especially in the light of the outstanding study of Agathias by Averil Cameron, *Agathias* (Oxford, 1970); cf. esp. 125–26, 136 for valuable remarks on Menander.

³ Not that anything should be made of this: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Malchus, Procopius, and Theophylact are listed; Priscus and Agathias are not.

⁴ Both Agathias (2.15,7) and Menander speak of education πρὸς τῶν νόμων. There has been a good deal of debate over the merits of πρὸς or πρὸ; cf. Cameron, *Agathias*, 140–41; and B. Baldwin, "Four Problems in Agathias," *BZ*, 70 (1977), 295–305.

⁵ It is clear from Agathias, *AP* 1.35, that four years was the usual length of legal training, but the rhetorical preliminaries must also be taken into account; cf. Cameron, *Agathias*, 2 note 1.

in an author's preface, it may not be altogether cynical to suspect that his performance was not the best.

Regardless of his scholarly performance, Menander became a young man about town. He enjoyed the Hippodrome, cultivated the theater, and frequented the palaestra, none of which implies a career of spectacular debauchery. It is evident from the poems of Agathias, Leontius Scholasticus, and other contributors to the *Cycle* that the circus and actresses were numbered among the permitted pleasures of the capital. Whether involvement in the θόρυβοι τῶν χρωμάτων connotes any serious political activity is now very much open to question.⁶

Worst of all, in Menander's own view, was his devotion to the palaestra, where along with his cloak were stripped off all shame and sense. This could hint at sexual escapades: wrestling is a regular term in erotic description.⁷ However, emphasis on the evils of nudity carries a clear suggestion of Christian condemnation of the old Hellenic ways. This is consonant with the evidence of the other fragments: Menander was without any doubt a Christian, and, as I shall show, one with a taste for sermonizing.⁸

Menander was redeemed by the advent of the Emperor Maurice, who was a patron of the arts, particularly poetry and history. Better still, he was amenable to subsidizing the efforts of novice practitioners, which inspired Menander to turn from the paths of idleness and apply himself to historiography.

So much for the content of this first fragment. Some of the Preface is literary convention.⁹ The autobiographical *sphragis*, for example, was the usual practice of historians, according to Agathias (*Praef.* 14). The modesty over his credentials as a historian (frag. 2) or his Attic virtuosity (frag. 12) is trite enough.¹⁰

Nevertheless, there are some distinctive features. At least we are spared the tedious accounts in Agathias and other writers of being compelled to historiography by the pleas of friends. Menander cheerfully admits to making up his own mind for reasons that are frankly opportunistic. Also striking is his candor *de vita sua* and the deficiencies of his relatives; could this be something of a deliberate burlesque of the *sphragis*?

⁶ See Alan Cameron, *Circus Factions* (Oxford, 1976), *passim*.

⁷ It is hardly necessary to document this at length: Paulus Silentarius, *AP* 5.259 (with Viansino's note), will serve as an example for Menander's own age. Lucian (?), *Asinus* 10, is perhaps the *locus classicus* (with bludgeoning humor, the heroine is named Palaestra); Domitian's *mot* on *clinopale* may also be recalled from Suetonius, *Dom.* 22.

⁸ In the present bout of confessional, notice the expression τὸ νοῦνεξ, an idiom perhaps peculiar to Menander, or at least one that is distinctively his. *LSJ* cites it only from an anonymous passage in the *Suda* (ed. Adler, A 2394); see *infra* for the probability that this passage is in fact from Menander. The phrase recurs in Menander, frag. 60, which is the only reference given in G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961). The expression is neglected by E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (New York [n.d.]). Its presence in the fragment under discussion may emphasize the sincerity of Menander's effusion.

⁹ For the conventions, see Cameron, *Agathias*, 145–46.

¹⁰ As far as we can tell from the fragments, Menander is less prolix on the subject of his own shortcomings as historian than Agathias. Mock modesty is not an ubiquitous vice in the relevant writers, as is evidenced by the pugnacity of Eunapius, frag. 1. Menander himself appears confident enough in frag. 11 when arguing the need to reproduce the exact text of a document.

Conceivably, although there is another explanation. Evagrius (*HE* 6.1) thought it appropriate to salute Maurice for (according to Gibbon) expelling from his mind the wild democracy of passions. It is notable that such a thing could be said in a work composed in the twelfth year of Maurice's reign: the image of a reformed sinner was clearly congenial to the Emperor. Hence, the admission of a wild past is a neat way for Menander to suggest his own similarity to Maurice, especially when it is allied to praise of that ruler for pointing the way to rehabilitation.¹¹

Not much can be offered by way of a biography of Menander Protector. He obviously produced his historical work during the reign of Maurice (582–602). The statement of Constantine Porphyrogenitus that he wrote under Justinian is probably carelessness of memory or expression, understandable since Menander's narrative begins in this Emperor's reign. The same error is made, for analogous reasons, in the case of Agathias.

A man completely lacking in education might be presumed neither rich nor important in Constantinople, yet there was clearly enough money to finance two sons in legal studies (albeit Menander's brother soon gave up). An advantageous marriage might be divined, or perhaps Menander and his father did not get on: lack of learning is a common charge in the language of ancient vituperation.

References to Menander in the sources call him only protector and historian. There is no suggestion that he was a sophist as, for instance, Priscus and Malchus had been. His own Preface guarantees that he did not emulate Agathias and become a lawyer. One would like to know more about his poetry, of which the only extant example is the aforementioned epigram on the martyr Isbozetes. Was this his sole effort, or one of many?

Most likely there were other poems, for the combination of poet and historian would be far from unique. His immediate predecessor Agathias is the obvious case in point. Olympiodorus of Thebes should also be cited: according to Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 80) he was a professional poet who also wrote history. Olympiodorus and Menander are the only two ancient historians whom we know to have burst into verse of their own composition.¹² By his own account, Menander took up history because Maurice patronized it. Since the emperor equally favored poetry, it is a fair assumption that Menander would have sought to make himself known in that genre also. There were established types of poetry through which a man could earn wealth and recognition;¹³ it is enough to cite John Lydus, whose encomium on the prefect Zoticus earned him recompense at the rate of one gold piece a line (*De mag.* 3.27).

¹¹ It is worth noting that Evagrius has been thought to have used Menander. For references, see E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, V (London, 1898), 496, where the notion is rejected; cf., however, *ibid.*, IV (1901), 518, where Bury had accepted it without comment.

¹² In his seminal paper, "Olympiodorus of Thebes," *CQ*, 38 (1944), 45, E. A. Thompson wrongly gave Olympiodorus a monopoly on this. The oversight was corrected by Alan Cameron, "Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt," *Historia*, 14 (1965), 490 note 127. The phenomenon can be seen in other genres; Diogenes Laertius, as an awful example, frequently inflicts his own epigrams upon the reader.

¹³ See Cameron, *ibid.*

One has the impression from his prefatory fragments that Menander was able to be both *roué* and writer without wanting or having to pursue a career. Although it is hazardous to assume sense or system on the part of the *Suda*, its entry for Menander would surely have given more on his professional activities, had there been any.

Nowhere in the fragments of his historical narratives is there any overt reference to personal experience or autopsy of any kind. There is no indication of diplomatic travel of the sort engaged in by Olympiodorus, Priscus, or Nonnosus, for example.¹⁴ It is explicit (frag. 12) that he had to rely on the official texts and the versions of key participants such as Peter the Patrician.

Inferences are, of course, always possible, but one should be extremely cautious. Impressive looking displays of topographical description often turn out, on inspection, to be rhetorical set pieces culled from sources or school-room. This is most notoriously true in the case of siege descriptions (see *infra*), but it can apply to all forms of "learning." In fragment 20, for instance, a passage replete with curious lore concerning barbarians, there is a brief discussion of the peculiarities of Turkish wine. What Menander offers may or may not be correct. The point is, the item does not imply any firsthand knowledge. Such topics were commonplaces; Priscus (frag. 8, to which the present passage of Menander is very similar in subject and content) has a parallel observation on Hunnic beer.¹⁵ By the same general token, when Menander boasts (frag. 10) that he will not flatter the great it means nothing for his own status; he is but airing one of the most venerable of all historiographical clichés.¹⁶

There is one other basic and pertinent matter that warrants a special word. In the *Excerpta de legationibus* and the *Suda*, Menander is cited as Menander Protector, which is his modern appellation. The usual view is that he was able to afford membership of the *protectores domestici*, on whose toy-soldier qualities Procopius (*Anecd.* 24.24) waxes notably sarcastic. This may very well have been the case, and I have no theories on other matters concerning Menander that would be helped by the demolition of the tradition. Hence it is not special pleading but neutral observation to point out that there is no mention of protectorate status in fragment 1. Naturally, one cannot be confident when dealing with fragments, but what we do have looks like a full and unabridged confessional. Menander says that he gave up serious pursuits, chose the worst way, and *κεχηνώς περιενόστουν*, which tells us nothing.

It is impossible to be sure just what the term protector connotes in Byzantine Greek of this period. In its transliterated form the word occurs only in inscriptions and papyri in the fourth and fifth centuries.¹⁷ John Lydus employs it

¹⁴ For Nonnosus, see Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 3 (Müller, *FHG*, IV, 178–80); this historian's father and grandfather were also diplomats under Anastasius and Justin I.

¹⁵ Cf. E. A. Thompson, "Notes on Priscus Panites," *CQ*, 41 (1947), 63.

¹⁶ Menander betrays none of the sourness evinced by Agathias (*Praef.* 16–20) on this subject; cf. Cameron, *Agathias*, 6, 34.

¹⁷ The word surfaces as a new one in the Supplement to *LSJ*. See the examples in H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (Toronto, 1974), 82; cf. A. Cameron, "Latin Words in the Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor," *AJP*, 52 (1931), 255.

(*De mag.* 1.46) as a synonym for *primoscutarius*. The definition offered by the *Suda* (ed. Adler, P 2884) suggests diversity of meaning: εἶδος ἀξιώματος Ῥωμαϊκοῦ. καὶ φυλάττει.

Menander himself uses the word only once in the extant fragments. In a rarely cited passage (frag. 60),¹⁸ a character is described as τῶν μεθορίων λεγόμενος προτίκτωρ (δηλοῖ δὲ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τὸν ἐς τοῦτο καταλεγόμενον). He supervised the preparation of ambassadorial lodgings, τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ λειτούργημα ἄνωσέν τε καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τῷ προτίκτωρι ἐπιτέτραπται. This presumably has to do with the duties of a *protector deputatus*. The passage obviously does not imply that Menander himself underwent such service. Given the various nuances of the term, to say that Menander idled around the capital as a *protector domesticus* is to state not a fact but an inference.

Menander would have referred to himself as protector somewhere in his Preface, judging from the fact that the only time he is so styled by the *Suda* is at the very beginning of fragment 1; elsewhere he is plain Menander. The title is confirmed by its presence in the *Excerpta*. If it relates to a period of dissipation as a guard in the capital it is not one by which the historian would have wanted to be remembered; not that he could control how posterity would refer to him. However, it is at least possible that he was a protector in a way that involved some genuine activity as a soldier. If so, this would most likely have happened in the reign of Maurice.

Müller published seventy-six fragments, of which the great bulk derive from the *Excerpta de legationibus*. How unrepresentative they are of the whole work is a matter for subsequent comment. A few (frags. 2, 10, 12, 30, 35a, 44, 59, 61) come from the *Excerpta de sententiis*. The final sixteen emanate from the *Suda*¹⁹ (frags. 1, 7, 31, 53, 56, 58, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76).

These last are inevitably the least reliable. All of them have the name Menander attached, save for fragment 56, a flattering character sketch of Maurice, which Valesius plausibly ascribed to our historian. Yet aside from the first fragment the reference is to plain Menander, which can obviously cause trouble. Hemsterhuis and Bernhardt, in their editions of the *Suda*, and Meinecke, in his edition of Menander, wished to transfer fragment 7 to Menander of Ephesus. Müller cautiously rejected this, but in an addendum (*FHG*, IV, 670) was inclined to reassign fragment 73 to the same Menander of Ephesus.²⁰

Nor is this all. The attachment of an author's name does not guarantee that it is the right one. Just as the *Suda* thrice assigned extracts from Theophylact Simocatta to Eunapius,²¹ it also gives to Menander items that belong respectively to Theophylact (ed. Adler, P 1245) and Appian (E 3835).

¹⁸ It is not adduced in the best accounts of the *protectores*: E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, I (Paris, 1949), 57–58; A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 284–602 (Oxford, 1964), 53–54, 636–40; *RE*, suppl. XI, col. 1113f.

¹⁹ The *Suda* also reproduces parts of the *Excerpta* fragments, ed. Adler, *Index Auctorum*, s.v. Menander.

²⁰ Since frag. 73 follows Agathias 3.5,9 (which it clearly imitates) in the *Suda* entry (ed. Adler, S 901), there is *prima facie* evidence for its being from the pen of Menander.

²¹ See Alan Cameron, "An Alleged Fragment of Eunapius," *CQ*, 13 (1963), 232.

For all we know, some of the fragments printed by Müller are wrongly labeled. This is a caveat that will have to be applied to any generalization about the work of Menander.

A related admonition is equally in order. Various anonymous passages in the *Suda* have been credited by different scholars to Menander Protector, largely on the basis of their content, in correlation with passages in the *Excerpta*. However, it will not do to assume that any unassigned quotation in the *Suda* dealing with the period 558–82 has to derive from Menander. At least two other historians covered much the same ground: Theophanes of Byzantium and John of Epiphaneia.²² Some of our items may belong to them. Linguistic analysis can sometimes be suggestive; in general, however, the Byzantine historians share the same repertoire of stylistic tricks and flourishes to a degree that makes ascription of anonymous passages exceedingly hazardous.

Bearing all of the above qualifications constantly in mind, we may proceed to consider the major features of Menander's work. Its title is given in the *Excerpta* as plain *History*, which is probably right. The same unadorned heading is attached to the narratives of Malchus, Candidus, and Agathias. Priscus of Panium was a little more colorful (or precise): the *Suda* reports his title as *Byzantine History*. Two historians, Eunapius in the fourth century and Hesychius in the sixth, apparently preferred *Chronicle*. The pretentiousness of Theophylact in calling his work *Ecumenical History* was unique. Equally untypical, as in so many things, albeit at the other end of the scale from Theophylact, was Olympiodorus of Thebes: he dubbed his work ὡλὴ συγγραφῆς. Menander once (frag. 12) refers to his own book as a συγγραφῆ, in a discussion of his own methodology, but this need have no bearing on his title.

It is just possible that the original heading or subtitle contained something like τὰ μετὰ Ἀγαθίαν. That would have a precedent in the case of Eunapius, whose title acknowledged Dexippus in this way. However, this does not appear to have been a very common form of title, nor is it necessary to envisage Menander striving to honor Agathias in such a formal way. The latter was primarily a starting point for his own narratives. As it now stands, his prefatory reference to Agathias is much less honorific than that of John of Epiphaneia;²³ nor does it compare with his own praise of Procopius (frag. 35).

Menander commenced his account in 558, where that of Agathias had been terminated by death. To judge by the *Excerpta*, it seems to have extended to the end of Tiberius' reign in 582. Given the tone of the Preface, however, one might believe that Menander at least intended to continue into the reign of Maurice. It would not follow from the virtual silence of Theophylact that he did not do so. The habits of ancient historians in the matter of acknowl-

²² Theophanes is known to us only from Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 64 (*FHG*, IV, 270–71); for John, cf. Evagrius, *HE* 5.24: the one remaining extract is in Müller, *FHG*, IV, 272–76.

²³ John of Epiphaneia calls Agathias the most distinguished *rhetor* in the capital. John was himself a *scholasticus*, which may be relevant to the form of praise here bestowed.

edgment of sources are well known. We know that John of Epiphaneia carried his narratives to 591, though he is never mentioned by Theophylact. It should be kept in mind that the Early Byzantine contemporary histories do not always adhere to what we might choose to think of as the rational bounds of a reign or reigns.²⁴ It is unlikely that the author's premature death is always the explanation.

In electing to cover a relatively small part of contemporary history in detail, Menander was of course doing nothing new. Nor was it simple emulation of Agathias. Olympiodorus is an obvious early link in the chain, with his twenty-two books on the period 407–25, but the genre is observable at least as early as the third century A.D.²⁵

Even on the assumption that Menander stopped where he planned to stop, namely in 582, we do not know in how many volumes his work was cast. Fragment 7 (from the *Suda*) is formally assigned to Menander's Book One, but the item, Thracian treachery, has no chronological bearing, and its authorship is disputed. Fragment 38, which belongs to the year 575 and has to do with the first acts of Tiberius as Caesar for the now insane Justin, is ascribed in the *Excerpta* to Book Six. That would suggest an average of roughly one book for every three years. However, fragment 43, which is formally dated to the second year of Tiberius' tenure as Caesar, is assigned to Book Eight. Niebuhr's contention, in his edition of Menander, that this must be an error is generally followed. Certainly it would leave very little room for Book Seven to have any substantial contents.

No other fragment is ascribed to a particular book. One or both of the two references in the *Excerpta* might be wrong. On the other hand, if fragment 38 is correctly located in Book Six, and if the rough average of one book per three years was maintained, then we could think in terms of eight or nine books for the whole work.

These would have been big books indeed, to judge by the detailed scale of some of the passages preserved in the *Excerpta*: fragment 11, to take the most notable example, runs to a good twenty-two half-columns of Greek text in Müller. Yet in terms of chronological scope, eight or nine books for twenty-four years of history hardly compare with Olympiodorus' twenty-two books for a period of eighteen years, or, for that matter, with Agathias himself, whose five books embrace only seven years of history.

However, it is clearly hazardous to think in terms of averages. All sorts of factors influence the amount of coverage given to particular periods and events. It is certain that the exploits of Maurice under Tiberius would have received full and favorable treatment. Not every embassy, treaty, or military engagement can have been accorded equal space. A particular siege would

²⁴ Eunapius stopped at 404, though we know from his frag. 87 that he was still alive in 414. Olympiodorus covered the years 407–25, and Priscus the years 433–74 (in each case, the closing date is more "rational" than the opening one). Malchus is more problematic, given the discrepancy between Photius and the *Suda* (cf. B. Baldwin, "Malchus of Philadelphia," *DOP*, 31 (1977), 89–107, for efforts to disentangle it): Photius says he wrote on the period 473–80.

²⁵ A certain Nicostratus, for instance, covered the period 244–60; cf. *FGrHist*, 98.

have been written up at length as a rhetorical set piece; the same goes for one or two speeches. It does not follow that every siege and every speech is elaborated on the same scale. Fragment 11, with its plethora of speeches and its full account of the individual clauses of the treaty, is obviously exceptional. Here, the detailed treatment is conditioned by the presence of Peter the Patrician as both protagonist and source. Not only does Menander parade his admiration for Peter, but he also employs the latter's own version of events; this was on a scale large enough for Menander to describe it (frag. 12) as a τεῦχος μέγιστον. Hence the disproportionate size of fragment 11.

The point is clinched by sundry observations on the part of Menander himself. In fragment 11 he tells us pointedly why he records the exact text of Chosroes' words to Justinian: ὥς ἂν μὴ ὑποτοπήσοι τις ἑτέραν φράσει παρατετράφθαι τι τῶν ἀληθῶς.... Elsewhere, he candidly states that he is giving only a summary of a treaty's terms (frag. 12), or the gist of a royal letter (frag. 54). The latter case is instructive: we are given only the νοῦς of Tiberius' letter, but Chosroes' reply is in *oratio recta*. This may well amount to a sensible realization that the historian's own creative powers, if not the reader's patience, were finite.

Most of what survives of Menander's work has to do with Eastern affairs. This has prompted some probably unfair modern criticism to the effect that he neglected the West.²⁶ One has to allow for the process of selection followed in the *Excerpta*. There, Eastern items often predominate for very good and practical reasons: it was not customary for Byzantine historians in the early period to ignore the West. We ought not to be misled by the famous complaint (or excuse) of Eunapius (frag. 74) that an Eastern-based historian could not inform himself about events in the West. The fragments of other members of the sequence of *Profanhistoriker* show that they could and would look beyond the immediate affairs of Constantinople. Photius (*Bibl.*, cods. 78–79) makes a point of this in his comments on Malchus and Candidus.

The example of Agathias is surely sufficient proof of the scope of his conscious successor. Fragments 8, 24–25, 49, and 62 are overtly concerned with the Lombards. A tantalizing item involving a city with seven hills (frag. 71) most likely alludes to Rome, and fragment 72 (on Narses) should relate to the West.

Byzantium was naturally the center of Menander's own world. A feature of his style is suggestive of his feelings: he frequently alludes to Constantinople as βασιλίδα πατρίδα or πόλιν (frags. 9, 28, 43, 47, 49, 54, 63, 64). This was an expression that began to be applied to the city in fourth-century oratory, when it was replacing Rome. To some extent, then, it is a rhetorical ornament. Nevertheless, its use could connote genuine sentiment. The phrase is also used of Rome, and sometimes of Antioch.²⁷ The Emperor Julian was being passionate as well as rhetorical when he insisted that Rome was ἡ μὲν βασιλεύουσα τῶν ἀπάντων πόλις (*Or.* 1.4). Menander almost invariably applies the

²⁶ Jones, *LRE*, 303.

²⁷ For references, see Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*.

phrase in contexts of people visiting or returning to the capital: Byzantium is *the* place to which one comes. In two passages (frags. 49, 62) he shows his feelings by contrasting the Queen of the East with "Old Rome."

There were few literary sources available to Menander for the actual events covered in his work. It is a moot point whether he used Theophanes or was used by him, or whether the two were independently composing their histories at about the same time.²⁸ That the two men were both natives of Byzantium need not suggest any sort of relationship.

There is not enough of Theophanes' work remaining to permit any real investigation; nor would detection of similarities necessarily make it clear who was following whom. For instance, in fragment 2 of Theophanes there is a "learned" allusion to the Persians calling the Turks Cermichiones οἰκεία γλώσση. Menander uses this same formula in the context of Turkish rites for the dead (frag. 43). But it does not follow that either of these writers drew upon the other for such exotic information. Such formulae and *flosculi* were literary conventions: a particular item might come from anywhere.

The only contemporary source cited by Menander (not that this is conclusive) is Peter the Patrician, for the Peace of 562 (frags. 11–12). As we have seen, Menander attributes a μέγιστον τεῦχος to Peter. Almost certainly, this does not refer to Peter's own historical work which seems to have terminated around the reign of Julian. His *Book of Ceremonies*, mentioned by the *Suda* in an entry that contains an extract from Menander's commendations (frag. 12), is an obvious possibility.²⁹ Alternatively, a special aide-mémoire or some particular account of the embassies culminating in the Peace of 562 will be thought of.

For antiquarian, ethnographical, and all such materials, Menander could have gone to any number of sources. Virtually none are formally adduced, but as I have remarked, this means little or nothing. In any case, to judge by the fragments Menander was not in the habit of larding his narratives with the names of other writers. Homer is once brought in (frag. 10), complete with quotation from *Iliad* 6.339; and there is a tortuous reference to Hesiod as the "Ascraean bard" (frag. 35).³⁰ This latter allusion is in the context of an admiring mention of Procopius, who, perhaps significantly, is praised for his style rather than his content. No other writers, ancient or contemporary, are named in the surviving fragments.

Fragment 12 offers a quite encouraging glimpse of Menander's approach to the writing of history. He thinks it appropriate to give the exact text of a treaty, albeit this is not possible in every case, without any Atticist rewriting. The apology is significant,³¹ but it need not rob Menander of all his credit.

²⁸ Krumbacher, 244, thought Menander might have used Theophanes; Bury (ed. of Gibbon, V, 495) was doubtful. To judge from his terminal date, John of Epiphaneia probably wrote after both Menander and Theophanes.

²⁹ *Suda* (ed. Adler, P 1406); Peter's Κατάστασις was exploited more than once in the *De caerimoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

³⁰ This was typically Byzantine, of course; Agathias was at it as early as *Praef.* 9, in the case of Aristotle.

³¹ Cf. Cameron, *Agathias*, 136.

It is possible that he had read and appreciated Olympiodorus on the importance of content over style.

In the same passage Menander qualifies his use and eulogy of Peter the Patrician by observing that he is on guard against the natural bias of an account of vital negotiations penned by one of the protagonists. This piece of common sense is all the more cogent for being applied to a particular source, rather than being cast in the shape of a generalizing cliché about the historian's own objectivity. Elsewhere there are signs of a skeptical intelligence, of which the statement ἀκήκοα δὲ περὶ . . . ἔμοι δὲ οὐ πιστά (frag. 25) is the most striking.

However, Menander betrays many of the faults inherent in Byzantine historiography. These will be noted in their respective contexts. Apart from echoes and imitations of Thucydides and the classics, the rhetorical nature of some of Menander's narrative can perhaps be most effectively demonstrated by a comparison of his account of Justin's reception of the Avar embassy (frag. 14) with the effusion of Corippus (*Laud. Just.* 3.231–401). Structure and content are very close. In Menander's version, as also in Corippus' (266–68), Justin bids the Avars say what they please. The gifts of Justinian are recalled at the opening of the Avars' speech in Menander and at its close in Corippus (303 f.). Menander, and also Corippus (274 f.), has the barbarians boast of their Thracian conquests. Justin replies in the historian's narrative without any demonstration of his usual temper; Corippus (308–9) is again in harmony: *nulla commotus in ira|tranquillus princeps*. The Avars are struck with fear by the imperial response; the poet (399–400) concurs: *contremuit stupefactus Avar magnoque timore|diriguit*.

It is hardly likely that Menander had either the ability or the desire to read the Latin version of an African poet. The similarities are partly conditioned by the facts, to be sure, but they reflect a common rhetorical way of describing a specific type of episode.

A word may be inserted here on Menander the military historian. Relatively few of the extant fragments bear on this aspect. There are two of some little substance (frags. 31, 58), in addition to fragment 73 (on siege engines) and the exiguous fragment 70, in which a gruesome death is the subject. His account of the siege of Sirmium is commended by Theophylact (1.3.5), which is a bad sign. Sieges regularly brought out the worst in late historians.³² And there would have been plenty of material for a set piece on Sirmium, a city that was for a long time an imperial highlight in the third and fourth centuries.³³

Nevertheless, even here there is some cause for optimism. The *locus classicus* for imitation was Thucydides 2.75.5, which contains the words δέρρεις καὶ διφθέρας. The phrase is reproduced by Arrian (*Anab.* 2.18), Priscus (frag. 1b), and Agathias (3.5.10). However, Menander, where the opportunity arose in the opening sentence of fragment 73, eschewed it, preferring βοείοις δέρμασιν.

³² The most notorious case is probably Priscus, frag. 1b; see E. A. Thompson, "Priscus of Panium, Fragment 1b," *CQ*, 39 (1947), 92.

³³ Cf. F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London, 1977), 47.

Fragment 11, the longest surviving extract, might fairly be used to exemplify some of the virtues and vices of Menander's approach. It is concerned with the delicate negotiations which led to the Peace of 562 between Justinian and Chosroes. The momentousness of this event, along with the fact that the Roman ambassador was Peter the Patrician, whose qualities Menander admired and whose version he followed, suggests that the episode was treated at disproportionate length.

This allows us to see the historian in full flight at various levels. On the darker side is the plethora of speeches. The first one, by Peter, is redolent of Thucydides, with its philosophical veneer and contrived antitheses. It should be noted that the effect is more one of mood than of linguistic pastiche: working through it with the aid of E. A. Bétant, *Lexicon Thucydideum* (Geneva, 1843; repr. Hildesheim, 1961), did not disclose any flagrant borrowings. The artificiality of the composition is betrayed rather by its indulgence in favorite Menandrian tricks of style.³⁴ Perhaps more revealing is the answering speech of the Persian Isdigunas, which is largely a tissue of effects repeated from Peter's oration.³⁵

Another tired device is the edifying tale of Sesostrius and his Tamerlane-like treatment of captive monarchs. Peter uses it to curb the arrogance of his Persian opponent. It recurs in Theophylact (6.11,10), and Sesostrius is also invoked as the Colchian avatar by Agathias (2.18,5).

On the credit side is Menander's concern to give the exact words of Chosroes to Justinian, his setting down of the main clauses in the treaty, and his provision of a Greek version of the pretentious opening of the Persian ratifying document with all of the Persian monarch's titles. The presence of a *hapax legomenon* εἰρηνοπάτριος here may be a tribute to Menander's striving after accuracy: he is not, at any rate, given to neologisms.³⁶

Menander's inclusion of a detailed account of the treaty terms has evoked surprise from a most expert quarter.³⁷ It does appear to be something of a novelty, the sort of thing one might more easily have associated with an Olympiodorus of Thebes. The explanation may simply rest upon the dominating presence of Peter the Patrician as protagonist and source, as I have mentioned. Or, paradoxically, the item can be explained as stylistic *imitatio*. In a passage replete with Thucydidean-sounding speeches, would not the detailing of treaty terms handily conjure up the exposition of the provisions of the Peace of Nicias?

Whatever else may be said, we should be grateful to Menander for his full account of the provision and exchange of Greek and Persian texts of the

³⁴ E.g., the figurative use of παραπέτασμα (frags. 9, 60), or πέφυκε in the sense of "is," frequent in the speeches and aphorisms of Menander but not employed in his ordinary narratives.

³⁵ For instance, the noun περιπτολογία and the phrase πρότεροι διαλεγόμενοι occur in both; Chosroes and Justinian are advertised in much the same terms; both legates have a prepared piece on Antioch; and so on. Thematically speaking, of course, such counterpoint is realistic enough.

³⁶ The only other one perhaps is ἀπατωλογισμός, also in frag. 11; it is printed as one word by Müller, but as two in Migne's text of the *Excerpta*. For Chosroes' title, cf. frag. 43, where Valentinus dubs the Byzantines εἰρήνης ἐργάται.

³⁷ Cameron, *Agathias*, 136.

agreement between the respective parties and the associated formalities.³⁸ To what extent he felt his Byzantine audience needed this background information, assuming that it was normal procedure, is an interesting question. One has the uneasy feeling that many of his readers would have preferred such items as fragment 20, the visit to Dizabulus the Turk, with its exotica, "learning," and reminiscences of Priscus' account (frag. 8) of the journey to the camp of Attila.

Menander's views on the emperors can at least be glimpsed from the fragments. He seems inclined to portray Justinian in the best possible light, albeit not constrained by that emperor's living presence. For seducing the Saracens by gifts (frag. 15), he is *μεγαλόφρων ἀνὴρ καὶ βασιλικώτατος*, whereas Justin is *ἐμβρίθης* for ignoring them. His policy of purchasing Utigur aid against the Cotrigurs is narrated without comment (frag. 3). For not launching war against the Avars, Justinian is commended by the senate as *ἀγχίνους*, and by the historian for *ἐμφρονέστατα προμηθευσάμενος*, which is suggestively close to his prefatory praise of Maurice (*προμηθέστατα*). It is not a Freudian slip when Peter calls him *δεσπότης* (frag. 11): the term is variously applied to Chosroes and others (frags. 17, 18, 28), and becomes a standard Byzantine word for emperor.

Fragment 4 is the most striking. Justinian's failure to attack the Avars is excused on the grounds of old age and feeble health. This passage is clearly modeled on Agathias' handling of the same theme (5.14,1), a treatment cast in more general vein. Like Agathias, Menander takes care to remind his readers of Justinian's earlier successes in Africa and Italy. It should also be borne in mind that there is something of a *topos* involved: Menander says very much the same sort of things about Chosroes (frag. 35).

The panegyric of Corippus does not reflect later Byzantine judgments upon Justin. This ruler is generally severely handled by the Greek sources.³⁹ Overall, Menander may have been less harsh. There is both implied and overt approval of his cancellation of subsidies to the Avars (frags. 14, 29), though the language used by the Emperor is once categorized as *μεγαληγορίᾳ πολλῇ* (frag. 28). For wishing to be *φοβερώτατος* in the eyes of the barbarians (frag. 15) Justin is neither praised nor blamed. The Emperor's dismissal of John Comentiolus for sending envoys to Suania (frag. 16) is implicitly approved by the reference to imperial *βουνοχέρια*, a distinctive term in the historian, in patching up the damage caused (frag. 17). The simple reference to Justin's insanity in the first sentence of fragment 37 does not permit us to see how this tragic event was handled.

When Justinian subsidized Saracens, he was *βασιλικώτατος*. For rejecting Avar overtures, Justin is said to have *βασιλικῶς ἐχρῆτο τοῖς ῥήμασιν* (frag. 29). Menander's handling of this whole question of the rival policies of subsidies and war is as fraught with inconsistencies and ambiguity as that of Agathias.

³⁸ For a paraphrase and comment, cf. J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire (A.D. 395 to 565)* (London, 1923), II, 120-25.

³⁹ See *ibid.* (395 A.D.-800 A.D.) (1889), II, 73.

To a degree, Menander's treatment is conditioned by Agathias', at least in the case of Justinian.

"In fact, albeit unconsciously, Agathias reflects both sides of the essential duality in contemporary attitudes to Justinian. Probably, indeed, he was evading a direct judgement." These sensible remarks of Mrs. Cameron⁴⁰ may not be quite the whole story. What we see in these historians is also surely a struggle between head and heart. All patriotic Byzantines must have yearned to see old glories restored and the barbarians smashed, but they were aware of the impossibility of this dream. Hence the emotional tension reflected in the pages of Agathias and Menander.

Thus the cautious and conciliatory policies of Tiberius are frequently endorsed. His decision not to aid Italy against the Lombards because of unavoidable Eastern needs is twice discussed and apparently condoned (frags. 49, 64). His responses and policies vis-à-vis Persia are praised for their prudence and foresight (frags. 40, 46). The Emperor's restoration of royal Persian hostages to Chosroes (frag. 51) is singled out as an act particularly pleasing to God.

No ambivalence attends the surviving remarks on Maurice, the inspiration and putative hero of Menander's history. Even if fragment 56, an encomium upon the all-encompassing virtues of the Emperor, is not by Menander, which seems unlikely, what remains is still untempered compliment.

In the Preface, he is both patron of letters⁴¹ and protector of the people. Before his own accession he was totally loyal to Tiberius (frag. 47). His old-fashioned sense of military discipline permits Menander a chance to indulge in the hackneyed business of restoring order among the soldiers by making them dig ditches and fortify camps (frag. 58). Εικότως is the historian's word for his decision to avenge the ill-treatment of Roman envoys by Hormisdas (frag. 55). The piety of Maurice is much stressed:⁴² he is both Christian warrior (frag. 57) and Christian champion of abused taxpayers and subjects (frag. 59).⁴³ Not that his virtues are invariably linked to the Almighty; he is also paraded as a man as provident as any can be against the uncertainties of war (frag. 59). That is high praise from Menander, with whom the mutations of fortune and man's inability to reckon with them are something of an obsession (frags. 10, 30, 44, 61).

It is not impossible that Menander ventured some criticisms of Maurice in the manner of Theophylact. His treatment of Peter the Patrician, for instance, shows that he is not necessarily blinded by hero-worship. It is true that much of his praise of Maurice is cast in platitudinous terms, but that need not mean that it is cool or enforced: platitudes as often as not connote sincerity.

Menander's attitudes to a few other individuals can be discerned from time to time. Not only does he in his own *persona* commend Peter's learning and

⁴⁰ Cameron, *Agathias*, 126.

⁴¹ A tribute echoed by Theophylact 8.11,13.

⁴² This could lead him into excessive respect for priests: Theophylact 1.11,20.

⁴³ Theophylact (8.7,3), however, concedes a tendency toward avarice.

legal expertise, but he also makes Chosroes (frag. 11) and John Comentiolus (frag. 15) issue similar compliments, an effective way of suggesting how widespread Peter's fame was.

Also on the Roman side, there is a short comment on the military successes of Narses, tempered by his retreat on an unspecified (thanks to the exiguity of frag. 72) occasion. The snippet again suggests Menander's ability to keep his heroes in perspective. Needless to say, an imitator of Agathias would have derived at least some of his approval of Narses from that quarter.⁴⁴

Fragment 37 emphasizes the major role played by Sophia at the outset of Tiberius' tenure as Caesar (the claim is repeated in the beginning of frag. 38 also). She receives the Persian envoy and sends her reply through the court doctor Zacharias, who, it is made clear, is her creature rather than a professional diplomat.

Is this to be construed as criticism of petticoat government and, by extension, censure of Tiberius? Perhaps; but we do not know enough about Menander's attitudes toward women in general or this Empress in particular to say so with any confidence.⁴⁵ And it should be noted that Zacharias recurs on similar missions for Tiberius (frag. 60).

Of the enemies of Byzantium, Hormisdas, son and successor of Chosroes, is painted in darkest colors as ἀνοσιουργὸς ὄντως ἀνὴρ, whose fierceness is contrasted with the humane mildness of Tiberius (frag. 55). He is similarly condemned by Theophylact (3.16,7 f.). In the fragments of Menander, Hormisdas is the "stage Oriental" rather than old Chosroes.⁴⁶ There is one interesting point about the latter worth bringing in here. In fragment 11, as we have seen, Menander provides the Greek version of Chosroes' titles. Although he is "Giant of Giants" and such, not one of his epithets denotes a conquered race. One cannot help thinking of a passage in Agathias (1.4,3) where Theudebert objects to Justinian's penchant for such titles. Could Menander be making a subtle comment?⁴⁷

Dizabulus, the Turkish king, is ἀγχίνους καὶ δεινός (frag. 18), a common formula of esteem that is used elsewhere of Sebochthes (frag. 36). The Persian envoy Andigas is ἐχέφρων, experienced, and wise with age (frag. 60). More condescending, and perhaps more typical, is the judgment on the Persian general Sapoires (frag. 50): his fame is that of a man who was οὐκ ἀγεννής.

On barbarians and foreigners in general, Menander can sometimes be objective and discriminating on levels other than individual. The Persians are recognized as being on a par with the Romans as τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πολιτευμάτων (frag. 11). Sandilch the Utigur chieftain is allowed a sense of honor both when he lectures Justinian on the ethics of barbarians not attacking other barbarians (frag. 3) and when he stresses the common bonds between such

⁴⁴ See especially 1.16,1-2; cf. Cameron, *Agathias*, 51.

⁴⁵ The toughness and ambition of Sophia is a theme of John of Ephesus (3.7).

⁴⁶ Menander may have been unusually mild on Chosroes; Procopius was very hostile (*BP* 2.9,8-9, for instance).

⁴⁷ If so, ambiguity would return to plague us, since in *his* ratificatory document (frag. 11), Justinian indulges in no title mongering of his own.

peoples (frag. 4). It is possible that the brief surviving comment on Odigar as "the greatest of Hunnic generals" (frag. 69) originally led to some genuine praise.

By and large, however, Menander does not rise above the habits of the age. It is asserted without qualification that barbarians have an innate tendency to be fierce, foolish, and fractious (frag. 48). Foreign ambassadors are invariably arrogant when they address emperors or their Roman counterparts, whether they be Persian (frag. 11), Turk (frag. 43), or Avar (frag. 64). Ethnic discrimination is hardly possible, for boasting is a mark of φρόνημα βάρβαρον (frag. 10). Attitudes like this once led Menander into calling Persia the "Eastern Barbarian" (frag. 11).

This sweeping generalization is ubiquitous. Thracians break oaths (frag. 7); Avar treatment of envoys breaks the law of nations regarding the respect owed to diplomats (frag. 6); the Saracens are a quarrelsome race (frag. 15); and so on. One absurdity is worth pointing out: barbarians, it is alleged, cannot even row boats properly (frag. 63)!

When foreigners are approved, it is frequently with a note of condescension. Biganes, although a barbarian, prefers honor to wealth (frag. 57); a proverb may be barbarian but even so has truth (frag. 10); the luxurious trappings of Dizabulus are summed up as οὐδέν τι ἀποδέοντα τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν (frag. 20).

All of this is terribly familiar from the pages of Procopius and Agathias.⁴⁸ One final example, however, might indicate a certain, no doubt unconscious, parody of such prejudices, or at least a nice sense of dramatic irony on the part of Menander. Fragment 18 informs us that the Scythian race is παλιμβολον; this is advanced as a Persian credo. Yet in the very next sentence it is Chosroes who poisons the Turkish ambassadors' food!

It has long been debated whether Agathias was Christian or pagan. In my view, Mrs. Cameron has decisively settled that issue in favor of the former.⁴⁹ No such controversy was ever possible in the case of Menander: his aforementioned poem on the martyr Isbozetes marks him as unambiguously Christian.

It might be a fair presumption that Agathias must have been a Christian, otherwise the pious Menander would not have acknowledged him so openly as inspiration and model, especially in a preface honoring the devout Maurice. However that may be, to know that we are reading a Christian historian is valuable when studying Menander's phraseologies and use of objective formulae.

Some of his references would have looked cool, even subtly hostile, had they stood alone. For instance, the definition of Christianity as τὴν κατ' ἡμᾶς δόξαν (frag. 11) or hymns as κατὰ νενομίσται ἡμῖν in the same passage. Even such a sentiment as ὁ θεὸς ἐκόλασεν the pride of Rome (frag. 11) would not by itself have been conclusive. But there can be no doubt about the sentiment that Sebochthes was ἀγχίνους because he had Christian sympathies (frag. 36).

⁴⁸ See Cameron, *Agathias*, 116–17, for a valuable discussion.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 89–111 (cf. 89 note 1 for a conspectus of scholars and opinions).

Given that we know where Menander stood, his use of such formulae as τὸ κρεῖττον (frag. 11) and τὸ θεῖον (frag. 59) serves to illuminate their meaning in Agathias. The tone of his writing suggests that Menander was enthusiastic in his beliefs. A merely conforming writer would hardly have wished to obtrude such opinions as the one that Theodorus was "wise" to say that a city defended by God cannot be taken (frag. 41). The emphatic and repetitive nature of the extracts preserved in the *Excerpta de sententiis* (see *supra*, p. 105) hints at a preachy historian. Given his hectic youth and the confessional tone of his Preface, we may be dealing with the fervor of a convert or a reformed sinner.

A miscellany of items bearing on Menander's methods and opinions may be gleaned from the surviving fragments. It is not always clear whether a remark springs from personal experience or simply a rhetorical repertoire. For instance, does the observation that all men naturally yearn for their native land (frag. 47) contain any autobiographical clue? Or could the two aphorisms on the evils of civil war and the one on tyranny (frag. 30) have any bearing on the usurpation of Phocas?

We encounter the overly familiar when we learn that wisdom comes with age (frag. 60) or that the common people are a φιλοτάραχον χρῆμα (frag. 30).⁵⁰ The noticeable iteration of the emphatic οἶμαι, not a common habit of Menander, in a passage of obtruded learning (frag. 20) may arouse a suspicion that the intent is to conceal a literary debt or borrowed erudition.⁵¹ However, the sage observation (frag. 11) that much diplomatic rhetoric is designed solely for bluff and counterbluff, the appreciation of Suania's geographical significance as out of all proportion to its intrinsic value (frag. 15), or the comments on the strategic position of Daras (frag. 47) do a good deal to restore some respect for Menander as a historian of sense and discernment.

Enough remains of Menander to allow delineation of the main features of his style and language. He is notably capricious in the vexed area of ethnic nomenclature. Persians are sometimes Persians, sometimes Medes; similarly, the archaic Colchi is interchanged with the modern Lazi; both pairs are used indifferently within the space of two sentences in fragment 3. The presence of Assyrians in fragment 11 is notable, especially as it occurs in the peace treaty clauses.⁵² Like Agathias,⁵³ Menander is not afraid of including Avars (frags. 4, 6, 9, etc.) without explanatory or apologetic formula; the same is true of Huns (frags. 3, 69), Slavs (frag. 47), Goths (frag. 30), and even such outright modernisms as Macrabandi and Taranni (frag. 41). The relative absence of that common Byzantine affectation, whereby contemporary tribes appear behind the mask of Scythians or Massagetae, is very welcome. Yet Turks are sometimes admitted unadorned (frags. 10, 18), whereas on other occasions Menander adds an explanatory phrase (frags. 19, 43). This same

⁵⁰ Cf. Agathias 2.11,2, 3.11,1, and elsewhere for similar time-honored banalities on the mob. The wisdom and age cliché may be compared to Menander's pejorative use of μαιρακιδῶδης (frag. 37).

⁵¹ The οἶμαι used to strengthen Menander's view of the childishness of Chosroes' letter (*supra*, note 50) should be taken into account.

⁵² See *AP* 9.810 for an Assyrian triumph commemorated by a statue.

⁵³ See Cameron, *Agathias*, 82, for the procedures of Agathias in this respect.

inconsistency is manifest with some toponyms: plain Pannonia in one place (frag. 63), the same province with explanation in another (frag. 9).

Another instructive area is military terminology. Here, imprecision and a striving for variety are discernible. For instance, the leader of the Saracens is once called φύλαρχος (frag. 17), the appropriate designation of a confederate chieftain.⁵⁴ On other occasions, barbarian leaders are referred to as ἄρχων (frag. 6) or ἡγέμων (frags. 10, 11, etc.). From time to time a Turkish or Avar leader is properly called Chagan (frags. 12, 27, 63), whereas Theophylact (1.3,8) finds an explanatory formula necessary on its introduction into his narrative. It is interesting to observe the word μόναρχος applied to both a Lombard leader (frag. 24) and a Turk (frag. 43). Equally striking is the term γενεάρχης, attached to Persarmenian leaders (frag. 47) and also employed in a letter from Chosroes to Tiberius (frag. 54). Conspicuous by its absence throughout is the word ῥήξ.

This brings us to the question of objective formulae and Latinisms. As is usual with the Byzantine historians, no set principle is observable. In a purist mood, Menander will resort to cumbersome periphrases to avoid *comes* (frag. 7), *magister* (frag. 11), or prefect (frags. 15, 19, 28). Roman officers appear as *strategos* (frags. 11, 19), hyparch (frag. 28), or taxiarch (frag. 34). Transliterations of the order of δούξ are never seen.

However, μάγιστρος appears three times without apology in fragment 11 and with a formula elsewhere (frag. 55). It could be that realism supersedes formula, since these usages occur in reproductions of treaty clauses and diplomatic letters. There is a similar case with *cubicularius*, employed in the same context not long after Menander had resorted to παρευνάστηρ to avoid it. There are other signs of the influence of content on language; plain μοναστήριον crops up in a section of treaty clauses (frag. 11), while the blatant Latinism κεντηνάρια is found in a passage dealing with Italian concerns (frag. 49).

Other notable Latinisms with objective formulae include particularly ponderous references to quaestor (frag. 39) and *comes sacrarum largitionum* (frag. 46), the reiteration of *protector* with and without explanation (frag. 60), two mentions of the month of August⁵⁵ (frags. 19, 41), an explanation of *naves longae* (frag. 48), and three allusions to the word *sacra* (frag. 11). The most striking plain Latinism, albeit one by no means unique to Menander, is ἀσηκρήτις (*a secretis*) in fragment 55. It is worth noting, finally, that Menander generally explains his words as Latin (frags. 11, 19) or Roman (frags. 46, 60) terms, eschewing such pettifoggery as τῇ νεωτέρᾳ γλώσσῃ (Theophylact 6.3,6).

Very striking, given his indisputable faith, is the avoidance of Christian terminologies, apart from the aforementioned μοναστήριον.⁵⁶ Allowance must obviously be made for the fact that relatively few of the extant fragments bear on the subject. Still, one cannot help remarking the variety of ways by

⁵⁴ Cf. Thompson, "Olympiodorus of Thebes" (*supra*, note 12), for this point.

⁵⁵ Similarly, Agathias (3.28,1) gives December (with formula).

⁵⁶ In this context, observe νεώς for church (frag. 11).

which Menander avoids saying ἐπίσκοπος: ὁ μέγιστος ἱερεὺς (frag. 27); τὸν προεστῶτα τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (frag. 57, repeated with slight variant in frag. 62); ἱερεὺς, ἀρχιερεὺς, and ἱερουργός (frags. 57, 62); ὁ τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην διέπων (frag. 63). Just as eye-catching are the phrases used to denote the Bible: τὰς θεσπεσίας βίβλους and ταῖς ἀγίαις διφθέραις (frag. 63). All of this represents Menander's most patent affectation, admirably illustrating the tension between style and content in Byzantine historiography.

All the speeches in the extant fragments represent diplomatic exchanges (frags. 3, 6, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20, 27, 29, 43, 55, 60, 64). Clearly, Menander makes the most of the most natural context for such exercises. Looking beyond what has been preserved, it is difficult to think that he would not have composed some speeches for generals to deliver before battles. As to the general nature of Menander's confections, little need be added to the earlier discussion of Peter the Patrician's effort in fragment 11. Romans, Persians, Avars, Turks—all are marvelously capable (as are their interpreters!) of orating in the same style with the same repertoire of linguistic effects. This is not to say that a speech in Menander can never have any relation to the original. Fragment 11, for example, could well reproduce much of what was contained in the accounts of Peter the Patrician himself. But one has only to recall the very long tradition of including speeches in historical narratives: for the Byzantine epigones, Thucydides was both their prime influence and chief sanction.

The display of learning or pseudolearning is very much a stylistic feature which can take several forms. Perhaps the simplest level is a parade of references to ancient writers. To judge from what survives, Menander did not much engage in this: a Homeric tag (frag. 10) and a circuitous allusion to Hesiod (frag. 35) are the only items on display. Two cognate demonstrations of classical learning are the Sesostris anecdote in fragment 11, discussed earlier, and the mention of Aeetes (frag. 3); this latter item, on inspection, turns out to be a minimal version of the more elaborate reference in Agathias (3.5,4).

Menander is more addicted to the exotic. Genuine interest should not be precluded, but when he talks about such things as Persian banquet customs (frag. 20) one suspects that his chief concern is to give the impression of a Herodotus at work. Some effects are inspired by closer sources. We have already seen that his account of Turkish wine (frag. 20) is paralleled by Priscus on Hunnic beer. Similarly, the mentions of Turkish rites of the dead (frag. 43; cf. frag. 15) are partly owed to an Agathian disquisition (2.24,10). The repetition of effects such as the two Golden Mountains Ektag and Ektel (frags. 20, 43) is not unreasonable since they do seem to be quite different places,⁵⁷ but it may imply a limited store of such learning.

The quality of Menander's information is hard to assess. He seems, for instance, to be mistaken about the Furdigan festival (frag. 15).⁵⁸ On the other

⁵⁷ See the discussion in Bury, ed. of Gibbon, IV, 540. Cf. also Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II (Berlin, 1958), 122.

⁵⁸ According to Niebuhr, followed by Müller.

hand, there is no reason to believe that he could not have found out the correct facts concerning the type of concubine given to Zemarchus or the meaning of the term Tarchon (frag. 20).⁵⁹ The occasional item is more a piece of vague dramatic coloring than solid information: the elaborate barbarian oath of the Avar Chagan (frag. 63) falls into that category.

Apart from the description of Dizabulus' court (frag. 20), which owes a fair amount of its structure and content to Priscus on the camp of Attila,⁶⁰ Menander would appear to have kept excursions and digressions in reasonable check. The vivid accounts of geographical and topographical hazards found in some passages (frags. 18, 21, 60) are all expressly included to explain their consequences for military strategy or the progress of a delegation, hence are quite defensible. Descriptions of the golden trappings of Turkish or Avar leaders (frags. 20, 65) or the Turkish "Devil Dance" put on before the Roman envoy Zemarchus should not be dismissed as padding or journalism, since many of Menander's readers would not have been well informed on such things. One item is worth noting as possibly indicating autopsy on Menander's part:⁶¹ the particular knowledge displayed of the city of Theodosiopolis, including the names of its northern and southern suburbs (frag. 41).

Turning to linguistic matters, one observes the medley of Atticisms and late usages common to the historians of the period. Some items that turn up in Menander had been satirized centuries before as hyper-Attic by Lucian (*Lexiphanes* 21): ἀμῆγέπη (frag. 55), δῆπουθεν (frags. 9, 11 [five times, both in speech and narrative], 18, 38, etc.), ἄττα (frags. 11, 12, 15, 17, etc.). Other noteworthy features include ἀωσγέπως (frag. 3) and quite frequent indulgence in the dual (frags. 4, 8, 11, 12, 20, 40, 47— of both natural pairs and such couplings as pairs of envoys, kings, etc.).

Related effects are on the order of θροῦς, the Attic form of θρόος (frag. 18) and ἐν χρῶ (frag. 73). Occasionally, Menander may have been led into false purism by unreliable lexicographers. For instance, in fragment 27 he employs αὐθαδιάζομαι, recommended by Phrynichus for ἀναιδεύεσθαι but in reality mainly a late usage.⁶² We may smile also over the conceit ἐπαλαλάζειν τὸ ἐνυάλιον καὶ παλαινίζειν (frag. 31), a most unlikely occurrence in a Byzantine army (cf. Theophylact 1.9,8, and 2.16,1).

The visibly late usages are standard: οἰκείος as a personal pronoun (frags. 3, 6, 10, 14, etc.); ἐς with the accusative for ἐν with the dative (frag. 9); ἐν and the dative indicating motion to a place (frags. 11, 14, 16, 17, etc.); and so on. Late words unsurprisingly are not always avoided (or avoidable); some notable cases are: φορολογία (frag. 14); ἀδελφότης (frag. 11) and the related κυριότης (frag. 28); and the technical term σπαλίων (frag. 73).

Various ingredients make up Menander's style. The obvious influence of Agathias need only be noted here, since it has been abundantly documented

⁵⁹ Cf. Moravcsik, *op. cit.*, 299.

⁶⁰ The accumulation of similar details (barbarian drink, giving of women to envoys, description of royal enclosure, etc.) is ultimately suspicious.

⁶¹ It could, of course, equally well derive from a source (written or oral).

⁶² Cf. C. A. Lobeck, ed. (Leipzig, 1820; repr. Hildesheim, 1965), 66.

by Apostolopoulos (see *supra*, note 1). Classical echoes and imitations are too many to classify, and are often as much a matter of mood and tone as actual linguistic borrowings. There are poeticisms from time to time, such as the Homeric ἱππόβοτος and ἀναιμωστί, both in fragment 60; δρομάς applied to ships is another interesting item.⁶³ Effects such as the placing of περί after its noun (frags. 4, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, etc.), or the sole extant case of dating events by the seasonal method of Thucydides⁶⁴ (frag. 41), go into making up the overall motley style.

One item may indicate some skill in reworking small points on Menander's part. In fragment 3 he has the adjective ὁμόσκευος. *LSJ* records this word only from Thucydides 2.96 and 3.95, in which it is employed in the context of barbarians and is coupled with ὁμορος, an epithet eschewed by Menander in the present extract in a sequence of three ὁμ-formations. This is not a major matter, but possibly suggestive of his methods of borrowing and adaptation.

Menander indisputably strove after style. Some little tricks and flourishes are discernible. For example, he often gives πέφυκε in the sense of "is" but restricts it to speeches and aphorisms (frags. 3, 6, 10, 11 [on 4 occasions], 15, 27, 29, 43, 48, etc.). Certain phrases tend to recur: ἀφανίσαι ἄρδην (frags. 3, 4, 29, with slight variations), or θυμῆρες with dative of person concerned (frags. 1, 9, 12, 35) may be cited. Favorite words can also stand out, of which δορυάλωτος|δοριόλωτος (frags. 4, 6, 11, 20, 27, 45, 46, 55) is a good example.

Certain fluctuations probably perturb the modern reader more than the ancient. Menander can, for instance, use αὐτοκράτωρ and βασιλεύς of the emperor in the same sentence, albeit that had been happening for centuries.⁶⁵ And problems with foreign nomenclature should earn some indulgence for the mutations Targitius-Targites⁶⁶ (frag. 28, in the space of two sentences) and Daurentius-Daurites (frag. 48).

Particularly distinctive of Menander's narrative is the colorful language he so often employed in diplomatic exchanges. Ammigus the Frank promises to fight on as long as he can hold a spear (frag. 8); the Turkish chieftain Silzibulus mocks the Avars for not being birds and fishes who can fly or swim away from their enemies (frag. 10); a barbarian proverb about dogs is adduced in the same extract to deter a Hun (frag. 10); a Turkish envoy boasts that his nation's enemies will die like flies (frag. 43). All of this, the opposite of the formal transactions of diplomats, interpreters, and potentates, may, one hopes, be as much a reproduction of the actual records as the result of artistic rewriting.

Ultimately, it is impossible to assess properly the worth of a historian whose work survives only in fragments, however considerable. The lack of other narratives for the period prevents us from testing the reliability of

⁶³ *LSJ* gives only δρομάδας ὀλκάδας, Aristophanes, frag. 470; cf. δρόμωνας, regarded by Procopius, *BV* 1.11,16, as a modernism.

⁶⁴ Cf. Cameron, *Agathias*, 62, for Procopius and Agathias in this regard.

⁶⁵ See Millar, *op. cit.* (note 33 *supra*), 499, who finds the phenomenon in Artemidorus Daldianus 5.16 "remarkable."

⁶⁶ In Corippus, *Laud. Just.* 3.258, he appears as Tergazis.

Menander's content. If what we have is a fair sample, he was at least at times a critical historian who used sources and witnesses with sense and discrimination. That the natural center and focus of his world was Byzantium did not blind him to events in the West. In such prejudices as those evinced toward barbarians he is typical of his age. With regard to religion, he appears to be a good deal more than a mere conformist.

For us, Menander is the penultimate figure in the sequence of historians from the fourth to the early seventh century. It is probably fair to conclude that, with the exception of his unambiguous Christianity (a factor that is tempered by his avoidance of Christian terminologies), Menander is a good deal closer to his predecessors than to his successor Theophylact Simocatta. In terms of style, at least, that is no small blessing.

APPENDIX

Some anonymous fragments ascribed to Menander Protector

The following twenty-two anonymous passages in the *Suda* have been conjecturally ascribed by various scholars to Menander. Sometimes with reason, sometimes without (as Adler twice remarks in the case of Toup). There is not usually a great deal that can be said either way, since it is a case of assigning fragments to a writer whose work itself survives only as such. The following remarks are offered in a spirit of caution and modesty.

A 2394: Ἀνεῖτο δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ κόμη, καὶ ποτὸν ὕδωρ ἦν: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπολελυμένη ἦν. περὶ Σαμουήλ τοῦ προφήτου φησὶν. Ἀνεῖτο δέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνέκειτο. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ Ναρσῆς, ὁ τῆς Ἰταλίας στρατηγός, ἐς πάντα συγκατεμίγνυε τῷ μεγαλουργῷ τὸ νουνεχές, καὶ ἐκοινώνει αὐτῷ τῆς φρονήσεως ἡ βώμη καὶ ἅπας τῷ κρείττονι ἀνεῖτο, ταύτηι τοι οὐ πρὸς τὸ ἐμμελὲς ἐκκλίνας, αὐτίκα καὶ ὄγε ἐπεραιώθη τὸ ρεῖθρον σὺν τῷ ρεῖθρῳ.

The first sentence derives from John of Antioch. It is always worth noting with which historians possible passages of Menander are transmitted in the *Suda* (cf. my earlier discussion of frag. 73, which accompanies an extract from Agathias). From ἐπεὶ to the end was assigned to Menander by Toup and Bernhardt.

We know from frags. 8 and 72 that Narses features in Menander's narrative. The latter passage suggests a generally approving attitude, which we would expect from the continuator of Agathias. The present extract contains the word μεγαλουργός, which is applied to Narses in Agathias 1.16.1. Notice also the distinctively Menandrian τὸ νουνεχές (see *supra*, note 8). On grounds of both content and language, this fragment is very likely by Menander.

B 401: Βόσπορος, πόλις περὶ τὸν Ἑλλάσποντον, ἣν Βωχάνος ὁ Τοῦρκος ἐπὶ Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως ἐπόρθησε.

For the attribution, cf. E. Stemplinger, in *Philologus*, 63 (1904), 619; De Boor, in *BZ*, 23 (1914), 12.

The capture of Bosphorus by Bochanus is mentioned both at the end of Menander (frag. 43) and in the opening of fragment 45. However, this event took place in the latter part of Justin's reign, when Tiberius was Caesar. Menander would not have given such a date incorrectly. Either the fragment is not his or the allusion to Justinian is a textual error for Justin.

- D 579: Διακεχαραγμένος: ξίφεσι πεπληγμένος. ὁ δὲ διεσώθη εἰς τὸν Ναρσῆν διακεχαραγμένος τὸ σῶμα.

The last sentence is ascribed to Menander by Bernhardt. There is a linguistic point to support this. The word here illustrated by the *Suda* occurs in the phrase ξιφειδίοις διεχαραζάντο, in Menander, fragment 43 (in the context of Bochanus and Bosporus, interestingly enough). This provides the only example of the verb in this sense in Lampe. Its presence here may constitute some sort of case for assigning the fragment to Menander; the mention of Narses neither helps nor hinders.

- D 1193: Διοπτῆρες: οἱ ἐπιτηρηταί, οἱ προφύλακες. καταχεομένου τοῦ ἐξ ἐπιτεχνήσεως ὁμβροῦ τῶν Ἀβάρων καὶ συννεφοῦς ὄντος τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ ἐσέτι σκοτώδους οὐχ οἳ τε ἐγένοντο οἱ διοπτῆρες διαγνῶναι ἐπιόντας τοὺς δυσμενεῖς.

Bernhardt awarded this passage (from καταχεομένου to the end) to Menander, adducing fragment 21. The latter passage is certainly very similar, involving scouts in bad weather conditions, to an episode concerning Turks and Romans. However, the very closeness may suggest something of a standard set piece, and it does not follow that Menander should be the author of both.

- E 498: Ἐκμελές: ἡμελημένον. ὁ δὲ δὴ Βῶνος οὐκ ἐς τὸ ἐκμελές αὐτῷ οὐδ' ἐς τὸ ῥαθυμότερον ἐτράπη ὁ νοῦς, ἀλλὰ συντόνῳ τῷ τάχει πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐχρῆτο. καὶ τᾶλλα πάθη κατὰ τὴν ἐκμελῇ λύραν ἐθεραπεύετο. φησὶν Εὐνάπιος. Ἐκμελῆς οὖν ἡ κακότης. ὅτι καὶ Θεοδόσιος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκμελῆς ἦν καὶ πάσῃ ῥαθυμίᾳ ἐκκείμενος.

From ὁ to ἐχρῆτο was ascribed to Menander by Mai. The general Bonus features in Menander (notably frags. 27, 31). Assuming he is to be equated with the quaestor of Moesia lauded by Agathias (1.19,1), praise of Bonus by Menander would come naturally. The phrase οὐδ' ἐς τὸ ῥαθυμότερον ἐτράπη ὁ νοῦς is paralleled by a boast ὁμῶς δὲ ῥαθυμίᾳ τὸν νοῦν οὐκ ἐπιτρέψω given to John Comentiolus by Menander (frag. 15) as a specifically Roman quality. It is at the very least possible that for reasons of content and language the fragment is by Menander.

- E 2452: Ἐπίλυσιν: ἔφοδον. ὁ δὲ πέμπει Ἰωάννην, ὥς ἂν προφυλακῇ χρήσιτο καὶ προκαταμάθοι τὴν ἐπίλυσιν τῶν βαρβάρων.

From ὁ to the end is assigned to Menander by Burney. There is no real clue as to authorship. The John in question might be the John Comentiolus of Menander, fragment 15 and elsewhere, but there are obviously too many Johns in the history of the period to permit any identification.

- E 2470: Ἐπιμεφόμενος: πρὸς γε καὶ πλεῖστα ἐπιμεφόμενος ἦν τοῖς Πέρσαις, ἅτε δὴ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἄδικα πεπονθώς.

Given to Menander by Gaisford, to Aelian (without any reason) by Adler. The Persian reference is no particular help, and I see no way of making even a reasonable guess as to the author.

- H 42: Ἡγεμών, ἡγεμόνος καὶ ὦ ἡγεμών. ἡγεμόνας ἐδέοντο τῆς ἀτραποῦ σφίσι ζυναποστεῖλαι, ὥς ἂν αὐτοὶ ἡγήσονται τούτοις ἐπὶ τὸ Σίρμιον.

From ἡγεμόνας to the end was assigned to Menander by Bernhardt. Mention of Sirmium is tempting, in view of fragments 25–27 and 63–66, but it has been shown what a large role this city played in earlier imperial history, which fatally widens the range of possible authors. For easy example, the fragment might bear on the city's capture by the Huns reported by Priscus, fragment 8.

H 424: Ἡπερ: καθότι. ἐδόκει δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ μὴ σφόδρα ἐπαίρεσθαι· ἥπερ ἔστιν ἄριστον πολέμῳ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου συμβαίνουσιν ὁμιλεῖν, ὥς οὐδενὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς βεβαίου καὶ πιστοῦ πάντως ὑπάρχοντος.

The phrase πολέμου συμβαίνουσιν ὁμιλεῖν was related to Menander by Gaisford on the basis of πολέμοις ὁμιλεῖν (frag. 41). This is notable, though hardly cogent. However, in conjunction with the sentiment expressed in the fragment as a whole, which is very much a favorite with Menander (cf. my earlier remarks on this), the point may give him some claim to the fragment.

I 356: Ἴμονιά. τὸ δὲ φρέαρ ἄτε ὀρεινὸν ὃν κοῖλον ἦν καὶ βαθὺ ὥστε δεῖν ἱμονιάς μακρᾶς. οἱ δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ ἀντλητήριον· παρὰ τὸν ἱμάντα.

One of Toup's wilder ascriptions. The fragment is slightly reminiscent of Menander, fragment 73 (there is a well in both, and both might be in contexts of siege), but there is no basis for any sober ascription.

K 553: Καταθέσει: καταπαύσει, καταλήξει. ἢ λήψονται αὐτὸν ἐπὶ καταθέσει τοῦ πολέμου.

Another of Toup's (from ἦ to the end). With regard to the word being illustrated, it may be observed that in this sense the present passage is the only one adduced by *LSJ* (it is not in Lampe). There is a similar use of the cognate verb with πόλεμον by Menander (frag. 11).

K 745: Καταρράκται: πέτραι ἐν τῷ Ἰστροῦ ποταμῷ, ὅρους τρόπον τινὰ ὑπὸ τῷ ρεύματι ἐπὶ παντὸς τοῦ πλάτους ὑποπεφυκότες, οἷς ἅπασιν ὁ ποταμὸς ἐμπίπτων μετὰ μεγίστου πατάγου ἀνακόπτεται, καὶ καχλάζων περὶ ταῖς πέτραις, ἔπειτα ὑπερφερόμενος ἔλιγμούς τε καὶ παλιρροίας καὶ χαρύβδεις, κυκλουμένου τοῦ ρεύματος, ἀποτελεῖ· καὶ τὸ σύμπαν, ὁ ποταμὸς κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ χωρία οὐ πολὺ ἀπέοικε τοῦ κατὰ Σικελίαν πορθμοῦ.

Kuster thought that this might be by either Menander or Eunapius. I am inclined to think the latter: in content, the fragment could be linked with Eunapius, fragment 42; as was seen earlier, this type of digression does not seem to be typical of Menander; and the relatively high-flown nature of the style appears more Eunapian.

K 2690: Κυμοτόμος: περὶ τὰς γεφύρας οἰκοδόμημα τρίγωνον τὸ ὀξὺ ἔχον ἐμπροσθεν ἐν τριγώνῳ σχήματι, ὃ δὲ οἱ μηχανοποιοὶ κυμοτόμον καλοῦσιν, ἐμβόλῳ νηὸς μακρᾶς ἀπεικασμένον· ὅπερ ὁ τῶν Ἀβάρων Χαγάνος ἐτεκτίνετο γεφυρώσας τὸν ποταμὸν καὶ ἐς τὴν περὶ Δαρδανίαν ὄχθην διαβιβάσας τὸν στρατόν.

Bernhardy gave this passage to Menander on the basis of fragment 63, where the Chagan of the Avars is bridging the river Saos. One should notice the phrase νηὸς μακρᾶς, in the light of the aforementioned long ships in Menander, fragment 48 (with objective formula). According to *LSJ*, the substantival use of κυμοτόμος is unique to this passage. We hardly know enough of Menander to say whether or not he would have such a technical piece of information.

P 47: Παλαμωμένων: χερσὶν ἐργαζομένων. τὴν ἐκ τῶν Ῥωμαίων παλαμήσασθαι σωτηρίαν.

The ascription from τὴν on is stigmatized as *temere* by Adler; but see P 2909 below.

P 456: Παρασχόν: ἐπίρρημα. εἰ δέ γε παρασχὸν οὕτω κατάδηλος γένηται δόξαι λέγειν, ὥς παραγέγονε λέξων περὶ τῶν πρέσβων.

Given from εἰ to the end to Menander by Bernhardy; in truth, only the reference to envoys even hints at Menandrian authorship.

- P 1109: Περιαιρεῖν: ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, ἀποκόπτειν, καθυφεῖσθαι. συγχωρηθῆναι δὲ τοῖς Κελτίβηρσιν ὑπὸ Τιβερίου πρεσβεῦειν πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον καὶ περιαιρεῖν, ἔάν τι τούτων δύνωνται παραιτεῖσθαι. οἱ δὲ παραλῦσαι ἐπρέσβευσαν τὴν σύγκλητον τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ τῶν φόρων.

Gaisford ascribed the passage, from συγχωρηθῆναι on, to Menander; Bernhardt was doubtful. Events involving Celtiberia certainly took place in the 570's in the reigns of both Tiberius and Maurice. Theophylact (6.3,6) instructs us that men from Celtic Iberia were now (i.e., in his day) known as Franks. On the evidence of his fragments, it is less rather than more likely that Menander would employ an absurd archaism for this people. The passage almost certainly relates to Byzantine history, though the actual reference could be a flashback to, e.g., the Celtiberian peace made by Tiberius Gracchus in 179 B.C.

- P 2311: Προαλάμενος: προπηδήσας. καὶ προαλάμενος· τῆς πληθύος μετεχώρησεν ὡς Ναρσῆν. ὁ δὲ ἐνηγκαλίσσατο αὐτόν.

Everything after καὶ is apportioned to Menander by Bernhardt. Outside patristic texts, the word under definition is very rare (only here and in Quintus Smyrnaeus 4.510). Menander is not notably given to rarities, but our evidence may mislead, and we have seen that he employs poeticisms on occasion. The form πληθύς seems not to have been used by Menander, albeit manuscript evidence on such a point is not worth much. The reference to Narses is suggestive, no more.

- P 2909: Προὔργιαίτατον καὶ Προὔργιαίτερον: ἀναγκαιότατον. προτιμότατον. Θέσθαι προὔργιαίτερον τοῦ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πολέμου τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν παλαμήσασθαι σωτηρίαν. ὅπερ ἔπεται φύσει ἀνθρώπου ἐν τοῖς τελευταίοις κινδύνοις τὰ σφέτερα προὔργιαίτερα τιθεμένων, ἀνεχώρησαν.

From Θέσθαι to σωτηρίαν belongs to Menander, according to Toup. Again *temere*, in Adler's opinion. However, the phrase παλαμήσασθαι σωτηρίαν occurs in P 47, his other "rash" ascription. It may well be that whoever wrote one wrote the other. And the next sentence in this fragment is very Menandrian in sentiment and phraseology: fragment 10 has the similar phrases ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις κινδύνοις and φύσει ἔπεται. The last sentence in the *Suda* passage may well have been influenced by Thucydides 3.109,2: τὸ ἐαυτῶν προὔργιαίτερον ἐποιήσαντο. If so, that would be suggestive, though not necessarily of Menander.

- S 588: Σκήψας: ἐπιβάλλων, ἐπιφέρων. Σοφοκλῆς· ἐν δ' ὁ πυρφόρος θεὸς σκήψας ἐλαύνει λοιμὸς ἔχθιστος πόλιν.
καὶ σκηψαμένων τινῶν προδοσίαν ὁμογλώσσων τοῖς Σκύθαις, τοῖς καλουμένοις Γρουθίγγοις.

Adler thought that from καὶ σκηψαμένων on could be from either Menander or Priscus. I would prefer Priscus or an earlier historian. For although, in terms of content, the fragment could relate to Justinian's campaigns, the term Gruthungi (equivalent to Ostrogoths) seems to relate to an earlier period. They occur, for instance, in Dexippus, Ammianus, and later in Claudian, but not apparently after the fifth century (cf. *RE*, VII, cols. 1872–73).

- Υ 583: ὑποστάς: πορευομένων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ γενομένων κατὰ τὸν στενωπὸν, προῆι μὲν ὁ Οὐλίθ, ὑποστάς δὲ ὁ Ἀναγαστής, τῷ δῆθεν ῥαδίως ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν διεξελθεῖν, τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς πῖλον ἀνέλαβε.

Ascribed under the influence of fragment 43 to Menander by Bernhardt. I have nothing to add to the cogent reassignment of this fragment to Priscus of Panium by A. F. Norman (*CQ*, 3 [1953], 171), though I would caution against that part of his argument which sees barbarian nomenclature of the -ith or -ich types as "in the best tradition of Priscus": Menander has such forms as Apsich (frag. 6), Maniach (frag. 20), and Koch (frag. 70).

Υ 743: Ὑψαγόρας: ὑψιλόγος. ἐχρῆτο δὲ κομπολογίαις καὶ ὑψηγόρας τις ἦν καὶ τραχύς. ὁ δὲ Βῶνος κατ' οὐδὲν τοῖς ῥήμασιν ὑποχαλάσας ἀνεμίμνησκε τῆς ἐν Σκυθίᾳ μάχης.

Assigned to Menander from ἐχρῆτο on by Toup. Bonus has already been discussed in a similar context. The language of this fragment is very Menandrian; for the adjective in question, cf. fragment 43: ὑψαγόρας γάρ τις ἀνὴρ (also frags. 6, 37, etc., for the simple epithet); for other ingredients of the present passage, cf. fragment 11: κομπολογία χρωμένου; fragment 15: βαρβάρων φρονήματι ἥκιστα ὑποχαλῶν. This accumulation may make the ascription plausible.

φ 715: Φριμασσομένη: χρεμετίζουσα, ἀγριουμένη· ἡ ἀτάκτως πηδῶσα. ἡ δὲ ἵππος ὀπισθόρμητα φριμασσομένη ἐχώρει καὶ ἀδύνατα εἶχεν ἐς τὰ ἄδενδρα ἐπιβῆναι. καὶ αὖθις· κτύπου τῶν ὀπλων καὶ φριμαγμοῦ τῶν ἵππων κατακούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο.

The words ὀπισθόρμητα φριμασσομένη ἐχώρει were attributed to Menander by E. L. de Stefani, in *Studi Italiani de filologia classica*, 18 (1910), 439. There is obviously no real clue to be had from such a snippet (cf. ed. Adler, V, 37, for the item).